

SEP 25 2006

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 105, 107, 109, 110, 112 and 114 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected applicants' claim 105 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Fields, et al. (EP 1 058 199 A2) publication. The Examiner has rejected applicants' claims 106-107, 110-112, 115-116 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Fields, et al. publication in view of the Kucmerowski (U.S. Pat. Publication No. US 2001/0013871) publication. The Examiner has also rejected applicants' claims 108 and 113 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Fields, et al. publication in view of the Kucmerowski publication in further view of the Shaffer, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,092,114) patent. Applicants' claims 109 and 114 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Fields, et al. publication in view of the Kucmerowski publication in further view of the Batchelder et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,691,708) patent. Applicants have amended applicants' independent claims 105 and 110, and with respect to these claims, and their respective dependent claims, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' independent claim 105 has been amended to recite an information providing apparatus comprising a reception unit adapted to receive electronic mail data, a determination unit adapted to determine whether a document file is attached to electronic mail data received by said reception unit, a conversion unit adapted to convert the document file attached to the electronic mail data received by said reception unit into WEB format, a generation unit adapted to, when the determination unit determines that a document file is attached, generate text string data representing a summarization of a document indicated by the document file, a first sending unit adapted to send the document file attached to the electronic mail data converted by the conversion unit to an external output terminal, and a

second sending unit adapted to send the summarization generated by the generation unit to a communication terminal when the first sending unit sends the document to the external output terminal. Applicants' independent claim 110 has been similarly amended.

The constructions recited in applicants' independent claims 105 and 110 are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record. In particular, the Examiner has argued that Fields, et al. discloses a generation unit [0016] adapted to, when said generation unit determines that a document file is attached, remove or strip the document file attachment and generate text string data representing an "abstract" of a document indicated by the document file [0011, 0013], wherein the abstract comprises a compressed version of the attached document file [0026]. The Examiner has acknowledged that Fields, et al. does not explicitly use the claimed nomenclature, specifically with respect to the term "abstract," but has interpreted the term "abstract" in applicants' claims to mean "information that has been summarized or condense form," and to include the compressed version of the attached file disclosed in Fields, et al.

Applicants have amended applicants' independent claims 105 and 110, the their respective dependent claims, to recite "summarization" instead of "abstract" to clarify that the text string data generated by the generation unit or in the generation step represents information that has been summarized (See, Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 11<sup>th</sup> Ed.), rather than the compressed image data of the Fields, et al. reference. In particular, the Fields, et al. reference discloses in paragraphs [0025] and [0026] that if an email includes an attachment which satisfies a given policy, the system strips or removes the attachment from the email, compresses the attachment and stores it in a given accessible location, and replaces the removed attachment in the email with a reference to a given accessible location such as by including an HTTP link or an FTP reference to the stored attachment. The Fields, et al.

reference makes no mention of generating data that represents a summarization of the attached document. Moreover, the compression of the attached document in Fields, et al. is not equivalent to summarization of the document since the compressed document includes the entire document in a compressed form, rather than the summary of the document. Accordingly, there is no teaching or suggestion in the Fields, et al. reference of generating, when it is determined that a document file is attached, text string data representing a summarization of a document indicated by the document file. Furthermore, the Fields, et al. reference merely teaches storing the compressed file in the file system and sending a link to a communication terminal of a recipient of the email (See, [0026]), and there is no teaching or suggestion in the Fields, et al. reference of sending the summarization to the communication terminal.

Therefore, applicants' independent claims 105 and 110, each of which recites generating text string data representing a summarization of a document indicated by the document file, converting the document file attached to the electronic mail data received by the reception unit into WEB format, sending the document file attached to the electronic mail data converted by the conversion unit to an external output terminal and sending summarization generated by the generation unit to a communication terminal, thus patentably distinguish over the Fields, et al. publication.

Furthermore, there is nothing added in Kucmerowski publication, the Shaffer, et al. patent or the Batchelder, et al. patent to change this conclusion. In particular, the Kucmerowski publication discloses a system of displaying a message on a display in which a part of the message starting with a first character and having an attribute indicating that the message is longer than the display, or a truncated part of the message, is displayed. The

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

system in Kucmerowski merely teaches truncating the message so as to fit a portion of the message on a display, and does not teach or suggest generating a summarization of an attached document file. The Schaffer, et al. patent only teaches converting a format of an attachment to a message before being sent to its recipient, and makes no mention of generating a summarization of the attachment file. Finally, the Batchelder, et al. patent discloses generating an abstract of a text message that conveys important information contained in the text message within a maximum length requirement. Thus, the Batchelder, et al. patent only teaches summarizing a text message sent to the recipient, and there is no teaching or suggestion in the Batchelder, et al. patent of generating summarization of a document that is attached to electronic mail data.


Accordingly, applicants' amended independent claims 105 and 110, and their respective dependent claims, patentably distinguish over the Kucmerowski publication, the Shaffer, et al. patent and the Batchelder, et al. patent, taken alone or in combination with the Fields, et al. publication.

In view of the above, it is submitted that applicants' claims, as amended, patentably distinguish over the cited art of record. Accordingly, reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Dated: September 25, 2006

COWAN, LIEBOWITZ & LATMAN, P.C.  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 790-9200

Respectfully submitted,



Anastasia Zhadina  
Reg. No. 48,544  
Attorney for Applicant